

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
Redfield School District
Accountability Review - Focus Monitoring Report 2007-2008**

Team Members: Donna Huber and Chris Sargent, Education Specialists

Dates of On Site Visit: January 15, 2008

Date of Report: February 5, 2008

3 month update due: May 5, 2008 Progress Report Received: 4-29-08

6 month update due: August 5, 2008 Progress Report Received: 10-31-08

9 month update due: November 5, 2008 Progress Report Received:

Date Closed: 10-31-08

Program monitoring and evaluation.

In conjunction with its general supervisory responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Special Education Programs (SEP) of the Office of Educational Services and Support shall monitor agencies, institutions, and organizations responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state, including any obligations imposed on those agencies, institutions, and organizations. The department shall ensure:

(1) That the requirements of this article are carried out;

(2) That each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the state, including each program administered by any other state or local agency, but not including elementary schools and secondary schools for Indian children operated or funded by the Secretary of the Interior:

(a) Is under the general supervision of the persons responsible for educational programs for children with disabilities in the department; and

(b) Meets the educational standards of the state education agency, including the requirements of this article; and

(3) In carrying out this article with respect to homeless children, the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended to January 1, 2007, are met. (Reference- ARSD 24:05:20:18.)

State monitoring--Quantifiable indicators and priority areas.

The department shall monitor school districts using quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas, and using such qualitative indicators as are needed to adequately measure performance in those areas:

(1) Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment;

(2) Department exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services as defined in this article and article 24:14; and

(3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:18:02.)

State enforcement -- Determinations.

On an annual basis, based on local district performance data, information obtained through monitoring visits, and other information available, the department shall determine whether each school district meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA...

Based upon the information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information made available, Special Education Programs of the Office of Educational Services and Support determines if the agency, institution, or organization responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state:

- Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Act;
 - Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act'
 - Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act; or
 - Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act.
- (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:23.04.)

Deficiency correction procedures.

The department shall require local education agencies to correct deficiencies in program operations that are identified through monitoring as soon as possible, but not later than one year from written identification of the deficiency. The department shall order agencies to take corrective actions and to submit a plan for achieving and documenting full compliance. (Reference-ARAD 24:05:20:20.)

1. FAPE in the LRE – Performance Indicator

State Performance Plan - Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.

1. Percent of districts meeting State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
2. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with not accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grad level standar4ds; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
3. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

Annual Performance Report Activity – Conduct an accommodation study to verify IEP teams are providing instructional accommodations if they are also providing those accommodation on statewide assessments.

Follow-up date: January 15, 2008

Finding:

Through a review of 16 student files, data gathered by the review team indicated the following:

1. The accommodations/modifications were appropriate for the skill areas affected by the disability in 13 of the 16 files reviewed.
2. The accommodations/modification provided for State/District wide assessments were provided in the student's instructional program in 13 of the 16 files reviewed.
3. The accommodations identified in the IEPs for State/District wide assessment were used during the assessment administration in 10 of 16 files reviewed.

Corrective Action: Document the specific activities and procedures that will be implemented and the data/criteria that will be used to verify compliance.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	(SEP Use Only) Date Met
Activity/Procedure: 1. The district will review current policy/procedure to determine why discrepancies are occurring. 2. Develop a process that will allow for the appropriate documentation and provision of accommodations for state/district assessments. 3. Train IEP staff and testing coordinator in the procedures/process.	Activity # 1&2 Within 1 week of receiving report	District Administration & District Staff	Met 4-29-08 Met 4-29-08 Met 4-29-08

<p>4. Implement procedures and collect data to verify accommodation are appropriately documented and provided during state/district assessments.</p> <p>5. Analyze data collected to determine if procedures corrected discrepancy. Repeat steps 1 through 5 if discrepancies continue.</p> <p>Progress Report data to be submitted to SEP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Written description of the districts review process to identify why the discrepancies are occurring. 2. Written description of the process the district will implement to correct the discrepancies. 3. Training documentation to include the date staff training occurred, name of individual who provided the training and sign-in sheet with the name of all participants/position titles, who attended the training. 4. Following the 2008 assessment window, the district will review 3 student IEPs from each grade level taking the Dakota Step. The district will use the attached chart to document accommodation information for each of the student files reviewed. A summary of the data results will be submitted to SEP. 	<p>Activity #3 By February 15, 2008</p> <p>Activity #4 By 6 month progress report due date.</p> <p>Activity #5 By 6 month progress report due date.</p>		<p>Met 10-31-08</p> <p>Met 10-31-08</p>
--	---	--	---

3 month Progress Report:

Issue Analysis:

Meeting 2-14-08: Chris Sargent-SEP, Gerald Bender-Elementary Principal, Rob Lewis-High School Principal and Amanda Boomsma, Testing Coordinator.

The discussion resulted in the identifying the following assessment issues:

1. Errors may be occurring due to lack of communications and recording errors.
2. Teacher may not understand the proper procedures for test administration.
3. Misunderstanding on the part of IEP team in when identifying individualized accommodations for students.
4. Teachers currently provide the Principals with a list of 504 and IEP accommodations to be used during S/D assessment. The list comes from student IEPs or 504 plans. The list may contain accommodations that are not "specifically marked" for S/D assessment in the IEP resulting in a discrepancy in the documentation.
5. Some special education teachers considered, "All" in the Campus drop down menu to mean it included state/district assessment.

Redfield School District procedure to correct issues:

1. An in-service will be conducted with all special education staff and Principals regarding the documentation of accommodations in IEPs. (Held on 2-14-08)
2. The testing coordinator will conduct an in-dept in-service to all individuals who are "test administrators" during 2008 State/District assessment window.
3. Each special education teacher will use the attached document to review the accuracy of documented accommodations for students on their caseload who will be taking S/D assessments in April 2008.
4. Special education staff will amend IEPs, if appropriate to do so, prior to the 5 week testing window for implementing accommodations.
5. Following the conduct of the S/D assessment, District staff will review the list of accommodations provided to students as documented by the "test administrators" to determine if "the accommodations identified in the IEP for S/D assessment were "USED" during assessment administration?
(Compare the coding on the assessment data sheet with those listed in the IEP).
6. If discrepancies are identified, district staff will meet and review procedures to determine the cause and amend the process to resolve the problems.

Staff in-service was conducted on 2-14-08. List of participants was collected and provided to the team leader.

Team Leader Comments:

Activities #4 and 5 will be reviewed with the district upon receipt of the 2007-08 accommodation spreadsheets from Special Education Programs.

6 month Progress Report:

The accommodations in the IEPs for six students were reviewed and compared to the accommodations provided during the April 2008 Dakota Step assessment. Accommodations provided were appropriate for the student's disability, provided during instruction and used as reported for State/District assessment.

Team Leader Comments:

District has met the requirements. No further action is required.

2. GENERAL SUPERVISION – Complaint Follow-up

Corrective Action Requirements from report dated February 22, 2006

The Redfield School District and the Huron Center for Independence will provide training by the consultant from the Center for Disabilities or other appropriate individual to Center staff, and other interested persons as time permits, on how to use communication tools and implement them to best meet Student's needs. This training will address consistency in the use of communication devices, data collection for purposes of IEP goals and objectives, and strategies for maintaining Student's access to the device while preserving it from destruction by other persons. The Center will submit to the Department of Education, Special Education Programs documentation of the training, including persons attending, topics covered, duration, date and location of training.

Corrective Action Requirements from report dated April 21, 2006

The school district of residence shall review its comprehensive plan regarding prior written notice and parent consent to waiver, and shall submit to the Department written assurance that all meetings from the date of this report forward will be noticed by prior written notice that incorporates all required content and that is delivered timely, or signed parental waiver of the 5 day notice requirement is obtained. The assurance must be submitted to the Department within thirty days of receipt of this letter.

The school district of residence shall review its comprehensive plan regarding the provision of procedural safeguards to parents, and shall update its policies and procedures as necessary to reflect the requirements of IDEA 04 regarding provision of procedural safeguards to parents. The school district shall submit to the Department a copy of the updated policies and procedures content within thirty days of receipt of this letter.

Follow-up: January 15, 2008

Finding: Meets Requirement

In follow-up to the original issues identified in the complaint reports, the team reviewed 17 student files to ensure prior notice and procedural safeguards were provided to parents. Notice has consistently been provided to parents indicating the procedures implemented in the Redfield School District have been maintained and meet requirements of IDEA 2004. Training was provided on how to use communication tools and implement them to best meet Student's needs.

Corrective Action: None

Accommodation Spot Checks

Student Name_____ Disability_____

Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:
Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.
S/D Assess Acc. As per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. As per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. . As per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. . As per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. . As per IEP
Accommodations used during S/D Assessment	Accommodations used during S/D Assessment	Accommodations used during S/D Assessment	Accommodations used during S/D Assessment	Accommodations used during S/D Assessment

1. Accommodations appropriate for Disability? Yes No
 2. Accommodations used during State testing were used in student's instructional program? Yes No
 3. Accommodations listed on IEP for state testing were actually used. Yes No
-

Student Name_____ Disability_____

Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:
Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.
S/D Assess Acc. as per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. as per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. as per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. as per IEP	S/D Assess Acc. as per IEP
Accommodations used during S/Assessment	Accommodations used during S/Assessment	Accommodations used during S/Assessment	Accommodations used during S/Assessment	Accommodations used during S/Assessment

1. Accommodations appropriate for Disability? Yes No
2. Accommodations used during State testing were used in student's instructional program? Yes No
3. Accommodations listed on IEP for state testing were actually used. Yes No